UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/943,136	08/29/2001	Scott Graham	CON1246-082B	9321

7590   08/19/2004

RIA FARRELL SCHALNAT
FROST BROWN TODD LLC
2200 PNC CENTER
201 EAST FIFTH STREET
CINCINNATI, OH 45202

EXAMINER
HO, THE T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2126	

DATE MAILED: 08/19/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/943,136	GRAHAM ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	The Thanh Ho	2126

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *29 August 2001*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-72* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-72* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date *4 and 7*.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

PTOL-326 (Rev. 1-04)   Office Action Summary   Part of Paper No./Mail Date 8

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the application filed 8/29/2001.

2. Claims 1-72 have been examined and are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

A. The following terms lack antecedent basis:

(i) said browser (line 3 claim 1). Correction is required.

(ii) said framework (line 3 claim 26; line 2 claim 27; line 2 claim 28; line 3 claim 32). Corrections are required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-8, 11-13, 18-24, 29-42, 45-47, 52-58 and 63-72 are rejected under

35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilson U.S Patent No. 6,697,815 in view

of Craig U.S Patent No. 6,757,708.

As to claim 1, Wilson teaches a web server framework (Fig. 2; web server 22,

Fig. 2) for browser-based applications (browser 202 of client 14, Fig. 2) utilizing an

application server (business programs of mainframe 24, Fig. 2; back-end server

contains application programs, lines 57-61 column 7), comprising:

a Command Servlet (gateway Servlet 204, Fig. 2) receives an HTTP request (the

request from the browser, lines 55-56 column 7; the Web's Hypertext Transfer Protocol

HTTP, lines 9-10 column 2) from a browser (browser 202, Fig. 2);

an Application Controller (UI beans 206, Fig. 2) receives information from said

Command Servlet (234, 236, 252 and 254, Fig. 2) in response to said HTTP request,

said Application Controller communicates with and receives data from said application

server (...information contained in the UI record concerning what should happen to the

data identifies a bean and a Java Server Page that are to be used to build a Web page

for presenting the data to the user..., lines 28-33 column 8);

a Java Bean created by said Application Controller to handle said HTTP request

(...instantiates a Java bean that has been designed for that particular data-set/object,

and sets the data of that UI record into the bean..., lines 13-15 column 4), said Java

Bean communicates with and receive data from said application server (...information

contained in the UI record concerning what should happen to the data identifies a bean

and a Java Server Page that are to be used to build a Web page for presenting the data

to the user..., lines 28-33 column 8), said Java Bean adapted to pass control back to

said Command Servlet upon receiving said data (return results 240, Fig. 2);

a Java Server Page (JSP 208, Fig. 2) receives a call from said Command Servlet

(invoke JSP 258, Fig. 2) after said Command Servlet regains control from said Java

Bean (...the back-end computer returns the populated UI record to the gateway

servlet..., lines 34-35 column 8), said Java Server Page attaches HTML to any dynamic

data represented in said Java Bean and format the output for said browser in response

to said HTTP request (...the JSP generates a HTML page using the information in the

aforementioned bean to customize the page in accordance with the user's original input

information as processed by the business software of the back-end and then returns

that page to the user's browser for display at the user's machine..., lines 18-24 column

4). Wilson does not explicitly teach compile HTML and dynamic data into a Java

Servlet to be run directly by said Web Server in response to similar future HTTP

request.

Craig teach a similar system in which a web browser invokes a server comprising

servlet, bean and JSP in order to receive HTML page (Fig. 3A; lines 35-57 column 8;

lines 10-24 column 9), wherein the results and data being cached in the form of an

object. The object is being stored within the server to be used to process subsequent

requests from the browser (lines 34-40 column 4; lines 47-57 column 8). It would have

been obvious to apply the teachings of Craig to the system of Wilson because the

server can process the subsequent requests locally using the stored object, therefore

improving the speed and efficiency of information retrieval as disclosed by Craig (lines 14-16 column 1; lines 41-57 column 4).

As to claim 2, Wilson as modified further teaches a Java Virtual Machine processes Java Servlet (...Java servlets that run on the Web server. The Java servlet replaces the CGI and runs directly on the Web server. With a Java virtual machine running in the server, e-business application programs can be implemented on the server using the Java program language..., lines 24-29 column 3).

As to claim 3, Craig further teaches a session cache maintained by said Web Server to track user information between said HTTP requests (lines 24-49 column 3).

As to claim 4, Craig further teaches Java Bean represents a business object (the bean's business logic (line 24 column 12).

As to claim 5, Craig further teaches CORBA-based messaging services and middleware (...remote application may access the cached objects. This remote application may use, for example, Remote Method Invocation technology, Component Object Model technology, or CORBA technology..., lines 37-41 column 5).

As to claim 6, Wilson as modified further teaches Proxy Pool multiplexes communications with application server (lines 26-55 column 6).

As to claim 7, Wilson as modified further teaches application server is a Backend Logic Server (back-end server, line 62 column 7).

As to claim 8, Wilson as modified further teaches an external database in communication with application server adapted to house requested data (...Web server might access a database maintained on a separate, back-end, mainframe. However,

the actual processing of the data obtained from the database was performed at the

server in a programming environment..., lines 57-61 column 5).

As to claim 11, Wilson as modified further teaches an error framework

(corrected and identifying the nature of the error, lines 43-44 column 7).

As to claim 12, Wilson as modified further teaches error framework provides a

common base for application-specific Java exceptions (FAIL or PASS indications, line

39 column 7).

As to claim 13, Wilson as modified further teaches error framework provides

language-specific formatting of error messages (Java program language, line 28 column

3).

As to claim 18, Craig further teaches framework is a connection framework

(connecting a HTTP request 405 to sources 450 and 435, Fig. 4).

As to claim 19, Craig further teaches connection framework provides a common

method of establishing pools of connections (...remote application may access the

cached objects. This remote application may use, for example, Remote Method

Invocation technology, Component Object Model technology, or CORBA technology...,

lines 37-41 column 5) to other resources (connecting a HTTP request 405 to sources

450 and 435, Fig. 4).

As to claim 20, Craig further teaches CORBA pools (CORBA technology...,

lines 37-41 column 5).

As to claim 21, Craig further teaches connection framework allows applications

built on said framework to define characteristics of pools (lines 5-24 column 5).

As to claim 22, Craig further teaches web server framework is a reference data framework (cached object being stored in the server, lines 47-57 column 8).

As to claim 23, Craig further teaches reference data framework provides a mechanism for applications built on said framework to store common lists of data in memory for efficient access by said applications (lines 5-40 column 9).

As to claim 24, Craig further teaches reference data framework provides a mechanism for Java Server Pages to build choice lists from data lists (lines 41-65 column 10).

As to claim 29, Craig further teaches web server framework is an international framework (clients from different locations, Fig. 2).

As to claim 30, Craig further teaches international framework provides a set of objects that are country-dependant (clients from different locations, Fig. 2).

As to claim 31, Craig further teaches objects are address, currency, name, and phone number objects (...user's identification and other available information about the user. For example, servers providing travel reservation services commonly store information about the travel preferences of each of their users and then use this information when responding to inquiries from a particular user..., lines 61-67 column 1).

As to claim 32, Craig further teaches international framework provides formatting routines that may be modified by applications built on framework (lines 21-41 column 2).

As to claim 33, Craig further teaches international framework provides methods for displaying said objects (HTML page being displayed in the client browser, lines 15-17 column 4).

. **As to claim 34**, Craig further teaches international framework provides methods for gathering data for said objects (...store information about the travel preferences of each of their users and then use this information when responding to inquiries from a particular user..., lines 61-67 column 1).

As to claims 35-42, 45-47, 52-58 and 63-68, they are system claims of claims 1-8, 11-13, 18-24 and 29-34, respectively. Therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 1-8, 11-13, 18-24 and 29-34 above.

As to claims 69-72, they are method claims of claims 1-3 and 6, respectively. Therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 1-3 and 6 above.

5. Claims 9-10, 14-17, 25-28, 43-44, 48-51 and 59-62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilson in view of Craig, and further in view of Prabandham U.S Patent No. 6,701,438.

As to claim 14, Wilson as modified does not explicitly teach a logging and tracing framework. Prabandham teach a similar system in which a web browser invokes a web server comprising servlet in order to receive HTML page (Fig. 2; lines 5-14 column 2), wherein the servlet engine provides logging protocols (lines 39-59 column 2). It would have been obvious to apply the teachings of Prabandham to the system of

Wilson because this provides a customized logging protocol to serve specific needs of a

particular application as disclosed by Prabandham (lines 17-36 column 2).

As to claim 15, Prabandham further teaches logging and tracing framework

provides a common method of logging messages and events (lines 9-20 column 5).

As to claim 16, it is a system claim of claims 1 and 15. Therefore, it is rejected

for the same reasons as claims 1 and 15 above.

As to claim 17, Prabandham further teaches logging and tracing framework

provides two levels of logging, each allowing differing amounts of data capture (failed

http request and valid http response, Fig. 2).

As to claim 25, Prabandham further teaches web server framework is a security

framework (security module provides the selected security protocols, lines 43-44

column 2).

As to claim 26, Prabandham further teaches security framework provides a

common model for applications to maintain security information available to applications

built on framework (authentication protocols assure that a request received by the

servlet engine has a verified source and the authorization protocols assure that the

verified source has appropriate permission, lines 45-47 column 2).

As to claim 27, Prabandham further teaches security framework integrates with

other frameworks to provide security information (integration between 202, 204 and

206, Fig. 2).

As to claim 28, Prabandham further teaches security framework allows applications built on framework to check security on any object type (lines 49-64 column 4).

As to claim 9, Prabandham further teaches a domain firewall isolates Servlet from application server (security protocols, line 44 column 2).

As to claim 10, it is a system claim of claims 11, 14, 18, 25 and 29. Therefore, it is rejected for the same reasons as claims 11, 14, 18, 25 and 29 above.

As to claims 43-44, 48-51 and 59-62, they are system claims of claims 9-10, 14-17 and 25-28, respectively. Therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 9-10, 14-17 and 25-28 above.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to The Thanh Ho whose telephone number is (571) 272-3762. A voice mail service is also available for this number. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday – Friday, 8:30 am – 5:00 pm.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents

P.O Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or fax to:

- AFTER-FINAL faxes must be signed and sent to (703) 872 - 9306.

- OFFICAL faxes must be signed and sent to (703) 872 - 9306.

- NON OFFICAL faxes should not be signed, please send to (571) 273 – 3762

TTH
August 13, 2004

MENG-AL T. AN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100